

1. Call to Order
2. Minutes of November 29, 2004 - Approved.
3. Board Administration: Recommendation from Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) regarding Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) request for Board membership. Paul Maxwell (CCTA) provided an overview of the recommendation from the Partnership Technical Advisory Council, noting that:
 - This was the second report from PTAC on changes in criteria for membership to achieve a balance of membership and retain a membership reasonable in size. A set of criteria for membership was outlined in attached memo.
 - Chief officer from all public agencies should be allowed membership.
 - Groups can be combined and represented by a single member with only one vote.
 - Membership requires active participation.

There was extended discussion about the merit of more or less inclusive membership criteria. Some members expressed a desire to have more process and criteria to determine membership. All agreed that participation in PTAC, the subcommittee of the Board, is a requirement for membership on the Board. Attendance at Board meetings is also a requirement for continued membership.

Three criteria for membership were suggested:

- 1) potential member must meet the eligibility requirements
- 2) potential members should not already be adequately represented by existing Board members; and
- 3) potential members interested should be represented by representatives rather than by individual members, if this will ensure active participation.

Steve Heminger (MTC) suggested that the bullet points listed as eligibility criteria in the PTAC memo be substituted into the Commission resolution. This would allow the Commission to establish overall eligibility and the Board to confirm membership. A motion and a second were made to accept Steve's suggestion.

The recommendation was approved.

4. Legislative Update

Budget Hearing

Randy Rentschler (MTC) reported on the Senate Budget Hearing on transportation, sponsored by Senator Dunn. He stressed the value of such hearings in keeping transportation at the forefront of the news. Two additional hearings are scheduled.

Rich Napier (C/CAG) noted that there is a perception that there is no cost in borrowing from the state highway account, but in fact these transfers increase the cost of construction by as

much as 30% or 40% when all factors are considered.

There was discussion about why the specific projects – included in the budget bottleneck map – were selected. Randy replied that MTC asked the CMAs to select projects that can move forward with construction in the next three years if state funds were not frozen. MTC will accept suggestions for projects that sponsors think should be on the list.

There was general discussion about how things could get worse before they get better. For example, the next State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) could require that projects be deprogrammed. On a more positive note, some expressed hope that transportation interests could prevail in protecting Proposition 42 this year.

While many expressed appreciation for the work MTC has done to get the message out to the press about transportation approaching a crisis stage, most felt that a stronger message needed to be sent to the legislature.

Bay Bridge

Randy provided a brief update on the East Span of the Bay Bridge. He mentioned that several hearings have been held in Sacramento including the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, which conducted an audit of the entire seismic program. Randy expressed hope that the Committee hearings would lead to a real dialogue about how the project can be funded.

Federal Reauthorization

There was a brief overview provided on the status of the federal appropriations process. There is a new Chair of the House Transportation Appropriations Committee. The Committee will take earmark requests from March 11th to March 19th. The House and Senate have very different positions. It is still unclear whether the appropriations bill will take the form of an omnibus bill or individual appropriations bills.

All were reminded that the reauthorization process was still in slow gear. Steve Heminger spoke briefly about earmarks and the structural problems arising from the authorization versus appropriations processes. Historically, California has done poorly on discretionary programs as compared to its share of the core programs, such as Surface Transportation Program (STP) or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ). He said that California would not make up in earmarks what it will lose due to reductions in the core programs. MTC will continue to support sponsors as they pursue earmark projects, but the Partnership should consider that the earmarks could actually result in less funds to California.

There was discussion about the principled approach of resisting earmarks in favor of more flexible funds versus the practical approach of playing the game that everyone else in the country was playing to secure earmarks. There was also a discussion that the playing field could be leveled by deducting from a State's formula funding amounts received in excess of their fair share in earmarks. However, this "level playing field" concept is not supported by

the Chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

5. MTC Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Policy

James Corless (MTC) reviewed the white paper in the packet on the proposed TOD policy. He noted the fact that the TOD projects being contemplated are appropriately scaled for each unique location. James reviewed the history of the TOD program, which originated with Resolution 3434, adopted in 2001, which mandated that land use around transit stations be considered as part of future transit projects. In December of 2003, the Commission adopted a five-point Transportation Land Use platform that is now a part of the Transportation 2030 Plan.

James outlined the three elements in the white paper:

- 1) Corridor Performance Measure – unite people and jobs
- 2) Corridor Working Groups – proposed process which will include CMAs, transit agencies, the Cities and planning directors who will work together
- 3) Station Area Plans – dealing with land use as well as access and financing of the projects

The Corridor concept is a major focal point of the TOD policy. MTC is proposing Corridor Working Groups in which CMA's play a strong role and will include transit agencies, local jurisdictions and developers. Some areas are already starting working groups and some areas have not yet created such groups.

The Station Area Plans are designed along the lines of BART's Ridership Development Plans and will include elements of the TLC program. MTC plans to finance the Station Area Plans from regional TLC and HIP funds. He discussed five case studies. James Corless offered his, and MTC's, services to present MTC's proposal to any City or County board that wished them.

Rich Napier (C/CAG) made a few comments about the Corridor Plan and questioned what would happen if the composition of the Boards of cities and counties changes mid-process.

Jose Luis Moscovich (SF CMA) questioned the performance criteria for success of projects. MTC plans on conducting a survey this summer to address some of Jose Louis' concerns.

James was asked about the involvement of the developers and how they are being approached to contribute to the effort? He replied that getting the developers involved is essential to the success of this project. Working groups are planned to get the elected officials, planning directors, transportation agencies, developers and business interests together to discuss the issues.

James was asked about what types of discretionary funds are being contemplated for use on these projects. Steve Heminger answered that the source of these funds is still in question.

Kathleen Kelly (BART) said that Tom Margro, BART's general manager, Steve Heminger and Bob McCleary met to discuss how a project in Contra Costa would be affected.

Agreement was reached to work together to see how the BART policy would integrate with MTC's policy.

6. Overview of Bay Meadows Redevelopment Efforts

MTC Commissioner Sue Lempert introduced Stephen Scott from the City of San Mateo and Jeff Holzman to give an overview of San Mateo's Land Use Plan.

Stephen said that San Mateo has been working on their Corridor Study for many years. In the late 1990's, San Mateo started their study because of the large amount of development in the County. The County worked with the Joint Powers Board to develop a long-range plan to decide where the new train station will be located. The group noticed that there were too few east-west connections across the Route 92 corridor. A Phase 1 Concept Plan was completed in September of 2000, which identified eight alternatives. Phase 2 was started in February of 2001 and was designed to develop a specific alternative. In February 2004 a recommended plan was presented, including a set of Transportation Demand Management Measures. An overall goal of 20% trip reduction was assumed. All plans must include assumptions of trip reduction and specific design elements of the project were studied to assure transit usage. Developers have to be shown how to plan developments to accommodate land use policies. In 1991 the City of San Mateo passed a voter initiative, Measure H, which sets maximum limits of building heights and maximum density levels. When suggestions were made to alter the height and density limits, there was considerable concern with residents about impacts on their neighborhoods. In November of 2004 the measure was passed again.

It was noted that San Mateo already has rail service and so it was easier to implement their plan whereas Marin, which does not yet have rail service, may find it more challenging to implement their plan.

Jeff Holzman, representing the Bay Meadows Land Company, described the tour group will be taking place after the meeting to see some of the details of Phase One of their plan. He presented slides that show some of the elements of the proposed plan.

There was a brief discussion about the differences between urban and suburban areas of the City of San Mateo.

7. Next Meeting: The next meeting will be set at a later date.